

Sinclair Broadcast Group's recent actions have illustrated the dangers to localism caused by media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

We are told that the news is supposed to "serve the public interest while supporting democracy" but what kind of democracy is it when media conglomerates are determining what serves our interests? We are often presented with one sided bias arguments that go through several "gatekeepers" before it even reaches the public. The interest lies not in the public but in the hands of those deciding and telling us what our interests are. It is to my understanding that in a democracy the public is to be presented with all angles of the equation which enables the individual to come to their own consencious regarding the issue. How is the public supposed to make their own decisions when there is a severe lack of coverage regarding certain issues.

We need to crack down on these conglomerates as they are becomming increasingly concentrated. I am sure that I am not only speaking on behalf of myself when I say that it is in the interest of the public to localize the media industry. Thus allowing us to utilize our right to free speech, which seems to lost more than ever to the hands of these corporate giants.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.